



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is intended by analogy to apply also to "those parts of the Empire which were either fairly romanized or else contained a large number of resident Romans" (page 260), the major part of the book deals with private and public life at Rome.

Beginning with a survey of "Rome, the Imperial City," its streets and its public buildings, the various types of Roman house *etc.*—the author presents in graphic fashion, first, a sketch of a Roman aristocrat's day. This is followed by a chapter on the life of the middle and lower classes, in which the meagre and biased allusions of the Roman writers are supplemented and corrected by archæological evidence (taken largely from Pompeii). In logical order the author discusses in successive chapters the Roman home, Roman education, the career of the Roman citizen in the army and in the public service, the place of religion, society and culture in the life of the average Roman, and finally "the last scene," Roman burial and burial customs.

There are some excellent remarks on the attitude of the Roman government towards and the relation of Roman religion to Christianity (though perhaps too little is made of the Oriental religions and too much emphasis is placed on philosophy, especially Epicureanism), on the Roman feeling for nature (page 175 *et seq.*), on the question of the unemployed and the relation of free to slave labor (page 244 *et seq.*). Pages 73 and 74 present some excellent and sane estimates of the individual emperors of the Early Empire.

Within the limitations set for and by himself, the author has done his work well, though there are occasional lapses in style; and the book should help to accomplish its author's purpose—to interest the general reader and to teach him to appreciate and "to feel in ancient life and thought." Some one hundred and twenty-five illustrations and several maps and plans add to the value of the book.

R. F. SCHOLZ.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

The Franco-Prussian War and its Hidden Causes. By ÉMILE OLLIVIER. Translated by GEORGE BURNHAM IVES. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1912.—xxxvii, 520 pp.

Of all those who were crushed by the overthrow of the Second Empire, two alone survive, the Empress Eugenie and Émile Ollivier, the head of the ill-fated ministry from January to August, 1870. The latter, at eighty-seven years of age, is just finishing a fifteen volume history of the Liberal Empire. Too much cannot be said in

praise of Mr. Ives's work in translating the gist of that ponderous work, following a resumé prepared by M. Ollivier and covering the Ollivier ministry with special reference to the diplomatic and cabinet activity leading to the Franco-Prussian war. Mr. Ives has done more, for he has translated and inserted as notes many essential paragraphs selected from the larger work and has added numerous appendices, including source and secondary material not elsewhere gathered together in one volume. The conception and execution of the volume are most praiseworthy.

As to the substance of the volume, it reveals no hidden causes of the Franco-Prussian war. Every prominent Frenchman connected with those disastrous times has published his memoirs, many of them furnished with contemporary dispatches and documents, and there is a considerable literature of an autobiographical kind from the German side. This particular volume can therefore add nothing strikingly new to what is already known. It is M. Ollivier's attempt to lay all the blame on Bismarck, the arch-conspirator, and to show that the author was not responsible for the mistakes of the Napoleonic empire in the crisis nor even cognizant of some of the important steps taken by his colleagues and Napoleon III. It is not history, in the sense in which the author would have us accept it; it is more in the nature of memoirs and to be used with the same degree of caution that is usually applied to sources of this kind. No one could judge Bismarck or M. Ollivier or Napoleon III on the history of the months between January and July, 1870, or on the basis of the Hohenzollern candidature or the Ems telegram. One must begin at least at 1866, or better yet at 1806, if he would explain the causes of the Franco-Prussian war.

As to M. Ollivier's qualifications to deal with the embarrassing situation into which Bismarck forced the French by the Hohenzollern candidature, two small points may be noted as significant. When the news came that the Hohenzollern prince had declined, and the whole situation was, for the time at least, in the French hands, Thiers, passing through the hall of the Chamber of Deputies, turned to Ollivier and warned him: "Now you must keep calm." The other is that in the larger work M. Ollivier devotes several pages to citations of definitions of the word *leger*, in order to show that Littré and all the lexicographers bear out his explanation of his famous phrase: "We enter on this war with a light heart." It is his contention that this meant "without sense of moral responsibility," and that this meaning was clearly indicated in the ensuing paragraph of his speech. One rises from reading the volume, even with all its intense human interest, with

a feeling that Bismarck was dealing with realities and that M. Ollivier was—and still is—dealing with words.

In view of the relations existing between Prussia and France after Königrätz, such a defence as M. Ollivier presents, even if it did not contain errors and misstatements, is a confession of weakness; and it leaves the January ministry and Napoleon condemned out of their own mouths. Disorganized finances, half-executed political and military reforms, hoped for but unconcluded alliances, confidence born of ignorance and misinformation, inconsequence in policy and indiscretion in utterance—all are revealed in what is meant as a defence. Bismarck was probably as crafty and unscrupulous as he is here represented; but he was master of himself and of every force necessary to the success of a cause infinitely nobler than any represented by the decadent empire of the third Napoleon.

One can not close the reading of such a book without raising the query already often propounded: why, since every leading actor in the tragedy has published his memoirs, are the archives not opened and controversy brought to an end?

GUY STANTON FORD.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Les Déplacements de souveraineté en Italie pendant les guerres du xviii^e siècle. By IRENÉE LAMEIRE. Paris, A. Rousseau, 1911.—viii, 538 pp.

Following his monumental studies on the theory of conquest into the Italy of the eighteenth century, M. Lameire finds himself in the presence of facts so varied and conflicting that no adequate synthetic principle has been found for treating them. Those who have felt in his preceding volumes a similar difficulty will find their problem not much simplified in this. Granting that the work is "more for the study of facts than the study of doctrines," one is inclined to ask of the author exactly from what point of view the facts are to be studied; especially as he, who may be presumed to have studied the facts in all their possible bearings, confesses at the outset that his own point of view, that of constructing a "theory of conquest," is somewhat sterile in results. Certain it is that if M. Lameire is intent on evolving such a theory, the most effective system of documentation is to isolate those cases which throw the theory into clearest light. To cite his papers *seriatim* from archive to archive, from bundle to bundle, can result only in a surplusage that is oppressive; and to leave them, as he has